arXiv:1403.7701v1 [stat.ME] 30 Mar 2014

The Fused Kolmogorov Filter: A Nonparametric Model-Free Screening Method

Qing Mai and Hui Zou

March 28, 2014

Abstract

A new model-free screening method named fused Kolmogorov filter is proposed for high-dimensional data analysis. This new method is fully nonparametric and can work with many types of covariates and response variables, including continuous, discrete and categorical variables. We apply the fused Kolmogorov filter to deal with variable screening problems emerging from in a wide range of applications, such as multiclass classification, nonparametric regression and Poisson regression, among others. It is shown that the fused Kolmogorov filter enjoys the sure screening property under weak regularity conditions that are much milder than those required for many existing nonparametric screening methods. In particular, the fused Kolmogorov can still be powerful when covariates are strongly dependent of each other. We further demonstrate the superior performance of the fused Kolmogorov filter over existing screening methods by simulations and real data examples.

Keywords: Variable screening, High-dimensional data, Sure screening property

1 Introduction

Consider a statistical problem with a response variable Y and covariates $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. When p is very large, a popular assumption is that only a small subset of variables are actually responsible for modeling Y. Let $\mathbf{D}$ denote the subset of important variables, $|\mathbf{D}| \ll p$. Variable selection aims to discover $\mathbf{D}$ exactly. Variable screening is less ambitious in that it only aims to discover a majority of $\mathbf{D}^c$. In

other words, a good variable screening method tries to find a subset $\mathbf{S}$ such that $\mathbf{D} \subset \mathbf{S}$, which is referred to as the sure screening property (Fan & Lv 2008) in the literature. Consistent variable selection is a very challenging task. It requires sophisticated estimation techniques, strong model assumptions and often advanced computing algorithms (Tibshirani 1996, Fan & Li 2001, Lv & Fan 2009, Zhang 2010). Because variable screening deals with a much less ambitious goal, it is possible that sure screening could be achieved by using some simple (both conceptually and computationally) method. This idea was first successfully demonstrated in Fan & Lv (2008) where marginal correlation screening is shown to lead to sure screening results in high-dimensional linear regression under certain regularity conditions. Since the sure independence screening paper by Fan & Lv (2008), variable screening has received a lot of attention in the literature and many variable screening techniques, both parametric and nonparametric, have been proposed and studied in recent years (Fan & Fan 2008, Fan et al. 2009, Fan & Song 2010, Fan et al. 2011, Li, Zhong & Zhu 2012, Li, Peng, Zhang & Zhu 2012, Zhu et al. 2011, Mai & Zou 2013, Chang et al. 2013, He et al. 2013). Variable screening is naturally appealing to practitioners, because if sure screening is achieved before doing a thorough analysis, the analysis part would become much easier with the screening subset. At least, the computational cost can be greatly reduced.

The main message in Fan & Lv (2008) is that although we should not do variable selection based on marginal correlations alone, marginal correlations can be used to filter out many noise variables and keep all important variables. Many new screening methods have been proposed with the aim to improve the marginal correlation screening method. Fan & Song (2010) proposed a screening method based on the marginal maximum likelihood for generalized linear models. Chang et al. (2013) proposed using marginal empirical likelihood ratios to rank variables and demonstrated its good performance. The nonparametric independence screening (NIS) (Fan et al. 2011) starts with a generalized additive model for modeling the regression response variable Y. For each variable X_j, NIS uses nonparametric smoothing, e.g. B-spline regression, to obtain $\hat{m}_j = \arg\min_{m_j} \|Y - m_j(X_j)\|_n^2$. NIS then selects the variables with large $\|\hat{m}_j(X_j)\|_n^2$. Compared with marginal correlation learning, NIS is more robust by capturing nonlinear dependence between Y and X. The quantile-adaptive screening (QA) (He et al. 2013) further improves the robustness of NIS by allowing heteroscedasticity in the model. Under such models, QA minimizes the check function instead of the squared error loss function to identify the important predictors. Li, Peng, Zhang & Zhu (2012) proposed using Kendall tau correlation to replace the usual Pearson correlation in marginal correlation screening so that the

resulting screening method is more robust and can be useful under a semiparametric single-index model with a monontone link function. The distance correlation screening (DCS) (Li, Zhong & Zhu 2012) is a model-free screening method that uses the distance correlation to replace Pearson correlation in marginal correlation screening. The distance correlation (Székely et al. 2007) between two random variables is zero if and only if they are independent. The Kolmogorov filter (Mai & Zou 2013) is a fully nonparametric robust screening method. It deals with binary classification problems and uses the Kolmogorov test statistic to screen covariates. The Kolmogorov filter has several unique nice properties. First, it significantly outperforms other existing screening methods for binary classification problems. Second, it works with all types of covariates and is invariant under univariate monotone transformations of the covariates. Third, it can have the sure screening property even when the covariates are strongly dependent of each other. This result is very promising because it was commonly believed before Mai & Zou (2013) that marginal screening methods tend to work well if and only if the noise variables are weakly correlated with the important variables.

Fan & Lv (2008) suggested an iterative screening and model fitting procedure to deal with the strong correlation issue in model-based screening methods. Although this idea has been empirically demonstrated (Fan & Lv 2008, Fan & Song 2010, Fan et al. 2011, He et al. 2013), its theoretical justification still remains unknown. Furhtoremore, its theoretical justification heavily depends on model assumptions and hence may not be very robust. It is now clear that variable screening can be seperated from the model fitting part. Both DCS (Li, Zhong & Zhu 2012) and the Kolmogorov filter (Mai & Zou 2013) have demonstrated that sure screening can be achieved without resorting to a particular form of model for the data. Moreover, we advocate the use of model-free screening methods in practice. The reaons are twofold. First, the model-free screening results are much more robust in the sense that the sure screening property can hold under much weaker conditions. The second reason is related to the choice of the statistical analysis tool in the modeling stage. Note that after the screening we have a low-dimensional dataset, and one may want to apply modern nonparametric learning methods such as boosting and random forest for further analysis (Hastie et al. 2009). Yet model-based screening methods typically eliminate such choices because one has to stick with the model used in the first stage. For example, if we apply marginal correlation screening or marginal maximum likelihood screening, we have to use a linear regression model or generalized linear model in the second stage although we can do penalized model fitting by using a penalty such as lasso (Tibshirani 1996) or SCAD (Fan & Li 2001). If the underlying model for the data is highly nonlin-

ear, then boosting or random forest is expected to be a better choice than linear models.

Our goal here is to develop a new fully nonparametric model-free variable screening method that can provide a unified solution to variable screening problems emerging from a wide variety of applications such as binary classification, multiclass classification, regression and Poisson regression, among others. The new method should also work with discrete, categorical or continuous covariates. Moreover, it is desirable to have the new method be invariant under univariate monotone transformations of response variable or covariates or both, because variable transformation models have wide application in practice. Imagine that a variable transformation model is decided to be the best fit in the second modeling stage, we do wish to see that variable screening results should remain unchanged if we would repeat the screening procedure by working with the transformed variables. DCS and the Kolmogorov filter are the two existing fully nonparametric model-free screening methods in the literature. Neither one completely meets our expectations. DCS does not have the invariance property under monotone variable transformation and its sure screening property heavily depends on a distribution assumption on covariates that they should have sub-exponential tails. In many applications, the covariates are heavy-tailed, and DCS may not be ideal in such cases. The limitation of the Kolmogorov filter is obvious as well: it is designed for binary classification problems and is inapplicable when the response variable can take more than two values.

To this end, we propose the fused Kolmogorov filter and study its theoretical and numerical properties. As the name suggests, the fused Kolmogorov filter is built upon two main ideas: the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistic as used in Mai & Zou (2013) and fusion. When the response variable is binary, the fused Kolmogorov filter is exactly the Kolmogorov filter proposed in Mai & Zou (2013) and fusion is not needed. The fusion part becomes critically important when the response variable is continuous. We introduce two levels of fusion. In the first level, we slice the response variables into multiple slices, compute a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistic for each pair of slices and then take the supreme of all pairwise Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistics. To make the method insensitive to the slicing scheme, we conduct the second level of fusion, where we repeat the first level for different ways of slicing and then take the average of their outcomes as the final screening statistic which we call the fused Kolmogorov statistic. The second level of fusion is important when the response variable is continuous or ordinal. The fused Kolmogorov filter ranks each covariate by its fused Kolmogorov statistic and screens out those covariates at the bottom of the rank list. By defi-

nition, the fused Kolmogorov filter is intuitively appealing, computationally convenient and automatically has the invariance property under monotone variable transformation.

The rest if the paper is organized as follows. The methodological details of the fused Kolmogorov filter are given in Section 2. In Section 3 we establish the sure screening property of the fused Kolmogorov filter under weak regularity conditions. We discuss these regularity conditions and find that they can hold even when important variables and noise variables are strongly dependent. This promising result suggests that marginal variable screening could be more useful than we expected. Sections 4 & 5 contain simulated and real data examples. Technical proofs are presented in the Appendix.

2 Method

2.1 Motivation

To see why the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic is very useful for variable screening, let us first revisit the binary Kolmogorov filter. When the response variable is binary, say $Y = 1, 2$, a variable X is indepedent of Y if and only if the conditional distributins of X given $Y = 1$ or $Y = 2$ are identical. Motivated by this simple fact, Mai & Zou (2013) proposed using

$$K_j = \sup_x |F(x_j \mid y = 1) - F(x_j \mid y = 2)|$$

to measure the dependence between X_j and Y, where F denotes the generic cumulative distribution function (CDF). Given the observed data, an empirical version of K_j is defined as

$$\hat{K}_j = \sup_x |\hat{F}(x_j \mid y = 1) - \hat{F}(x_j \mid y = 2)|$$

where $\hat{F}$ denotes the generic empirical CDF. Mai & Zou (2013) demonstrated the strong theoretcial and numerical performance of the binary Kolmogorov filter.

Given the success of the binary Kolmogorov filter, it is natural to ask what is its counterpart for a continuous response variable or a general discrete variable (like counts data in Poisson regression). First, it seems straightforward to consider

$$K_j^* = \sup_{y_1, y_2} \sup_x |F_j(x \mid Y = y_1) - F_j(x \mid Y = y_2)| \tag{1}$$

because $K_j^* = 0$ if and only if X_j is independent of Y. Thus K_j^* is a natural generalization of K_j. In order to use K_j^*, we must have an empirical version of K_j^*. This step is trivial for the binary response case, it is however much more difficult when Y takes infinite values, because it requires the knowledge of $F_j(x \mid y)$ for all possible values y. On the other hand, we can find an approximation of K_j^* by slicing the response. Define a partition

$$\mathbf{G} = \{[a_l, a_{l+1}) : a_l < a_{l+1}, l = 0, \cdots, G-1, \text{ and } \cup_{j=1}^{G-1} [a_l, a_{l+1}) \backslash \{a_0\} = \mathbb{R}\},$$

where $a_0 = -\infty$ and $a_G = \infty$. Note that the interval (a_0, a_1) is open, but we abuse the notation a little by writing the intervals $[a_l, a_{l+1})$ for all l. Each $[a_l, a_{l+1})$ is called a slice. We then define a random variable $H \in \{1, \cdots, G\}$ such that $H = l + 1$ if and only if Y is in the l'th slice. In particular, if Y is discrete as in a multiclass problem, i.e., $Y = 1, \ldots, G$, we can set $H = Y$. Now let

$$K_j^{\mathbf{G}} = \max_{l,m} \sup_x |F_j(x \mid H = l) - F_j(x \mid H = m)|,$$

where $F_j(x \mid H_j = l) = \Pr(X_j \leq x \mid H_j = l)$.

The idea of slicing is very natural. First, If Y is binary, $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ and K_j are the same. If Y is multiclass, the slicing breaks the multiclass problem into pairwise binary problems. This strategy has been proven successful as a method for generalizing a binary classifier to its multiclass counterpart (Hastie & Tibshirani 2003). Yet $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ can be still be computed when Y is a count that takes infinite discrete values, such as in the Poisson regression model. When Y is continuous, slicing is widely used in the field of sufficient dimension reduction (Li 1991, Cook & Weisberg 1991) to infer about the conditional means and/or variances of predictors. However, these sufficient dimension reduction methods generally deal with problems with large sample sizes comparing to the dimension. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first to utilize slicing for variable screening for large p and small n problems.

It is obvious that X_j is independent of Y if and only if $K_j^{\mathbf{G}} = 0$ when Y takes finite values and each possible value forms a slice. In what follows, we assume that Y is continuous, as it is the more challenging case. The following lemma shows that $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ sheds light on the dependence between Y and X_j as well when Y is continuous.

Lemma 1. *(a) X_j is independent of Y if and only if $K_j^{\mathbf{G}} = 0$ for all possible choices of $\mathbf{G}$.*

(b) Assume that X_j is not independent of Y and for any fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Pr(Y \leq y \mid X_j = x)$ is not a constant in x, then $K_j^{\mathbf{G}} \neq 0$ for any $\mathbf{G}$.

(c) Assume that $F_j(x \mid y)$ is continuous in y. If $\max_{l=1,\ldots,G} \Pr(H = l) \to 0$ as $G \to \infty$, then $K_j^{\mathbf{G}} \to K_j^*$ as $G \to \infty$,where K_j^* is defined in (1)*. Therefore, for X_j not independent of Y, $K_j^{\mathbf{G}} > 0$ for sufficiently large G.*

Although we intitially proposed $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ as a surrogate of K_j^* and Lemma 1 part (c) indicates that as well, it turns out that $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ could be a better measure for variable screening than K_j^*. To see this interesting point, we present the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *If (X_j, Y) has a bivariate Gaussian copula distribution such that, after transformation via two monotone functions g_1, g_2, $(g_1(X_j), g_2(Y))$ is jointly normal with correlations $\rho_j = \mathrm{Cor}(g_1(X_j), g_2(Y))$ and $g_1(X_j), g_2(Y)$ are margimally standard normal. Then we have the following two conclusions.*

(a) $K_j^* = 1$ if $\rho_j \neq 0$ and $K_j^* = 0$ otherwise.

(b) Suppose Y is sliced at $\frac{l}{G}$'th quantile of Y for $l = 1, \ldots, G-1$. Then $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ can be expressed as

$$K_j^{\mathbf{G}} = G \int_{-\infty}^{\Phi^{-1}(1/G)} \left(2\Phi(\frac{-|\rho_j| y}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}) - 1 \right) \frac{e^{-y^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \, \mathrm{d}\, y.$$

Consequently, for any G, $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ is a strictly increasing function in $|\rho_j|$.

With Lemma 2 in mind, we revisit the variable screening problem under a high-dimensional linear regression model as examined in (Fan & Lv 2008). For simplicity, assume that the model is

$$Y = X_1 + X_2 + Z$$

and

$$X_j = aX_1 + Z_j, \ j \geq 3$$

where X_1, X_2, Z, Z_j are independent $N(0,1)$ variables. Then we have

$$\mathrm{Cor}(X_1, Y) = \mathrm{Cor}(X_1, Y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Cor}(X_j, Y) = \frac{a}{\sqrt{3(1+a^2)}}$$

So this is a perfect case for using Fan & Lv (2008)'s marginal correlation screening. By Lemma 2 we have the following results:

$$K_j^* = 1 \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$$

$$K_1^{\mathbf{G}} = K_2^{\mathbf{G}} > K_j^{\mathbf{G}}, \quad j = 3, \ldots.$$

Thus, K_j^* cannot seperate $(X_j, j \geq 3)$ from X_1, X_2 no matter how small a is. On the other hand, $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ works perfectly in this example, just like the marginal correlations. Of course, $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ in general works much better than $\mathrm{Cor}(X_j, Y)$, which will be clearly demonstrated in the later sections.

2.2 The Fused Kolmogorov Filter

In this subsection we show how to use $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ for variable screening based on a random sample $(\mathbf{X}^i, Y^i)_{i=1}^n$. We first need to estimater $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ accurately for all p variables. Given a partition $\mathbf{G}$, we estimate $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ by

$$\hat{K}_j^{\mathbf{G}} = \max_{(l,m)} \sup_y |\hat{F}_j(x \mid H_j = l) - \hat{F}_j(x \mid H_j = m)|, \tag{2}$$

where

$$\hat{F}_j(x \mid H = l) = \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{H^i = l} 1(X_j^i \leq x), \tag{3}$$

and n_l is the sample size within the lth slice and $H^i = l$ if Y^i is in the lth slice.

If Y is a multi-level categorical variable, then the partion is simply done according to Y's value. When Y has infinite many possible values, the partion/slicing scheme can be important. With finite sample size, it is important to have enough sample sizes within each slice to control the estimation variance. As mentioned in introduction, the idea of slicing response variable has been used by researchers in sufficient dimension reduction. Early researchers proved that the sliced inverse regression (SIR) can be consistent even when there are only two observations in each slice (Li 1991, Hsing & Carroll 1992), which implies that SIR is reasonably insensitive to the slicing scheme. Yet Zhu & Ng (1995) later observed that, even though SIR can be consistent for all slicing schemes with the same number of observations in each slice, there is a loss of efficiency when there are too many slices. Based on our experience, the choice of slices does not affect variable screening results very much. However, significant improvement

can be achived by fusion. Suppose that we have N different partitions, $\mathbf{G}_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, where each partition $\mathbf{G}_i$ contains G_i intervals. Then we let

$$\hat{K}_j = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{K}_j^{\mathbf{G}_i}.$$

By doing so, we combine the information from all $\mathbf{G}_i$. This fusion step is motivated by Cook & Zhang (2013) who showed that in sufficient dimension reduction combining several slicing schemes works better than the usual practice relying on a single slicing scheme. As shown Section 4, fusion does yield superior variable screening results to using a single slicing scheme.

We suggest an intuitive uniform slicing to partition data into G slice. If Y is categorical with levels $1, \ldots, G$, or Y is discrete with finite possible values $1, \ldots, G$, we set $H = Y$. If Y is discrete and can take infinite values as in a Poisson regression model, we set $H = Y + 1$ if $Y < G - 1$ and $H = G$ if $Y \geq G - 1$. For the case where Y is continuous, we let the partition $\mathbf{G}$ contain the intervals bounded by the $\frac{l}{G}$th sample quantiles of Y for $l = 0, \ldots, G$. From now on, we always write $\hat{K}(G) = \hat{K}^{\mathbf{G}}$ when $\mathbf{G}$ is a uniform partition with G many slices. By fusion, we consider multiple uniform slicing $\mathbf{G}_i, 1 \leq i \leq N$ where $\mathbf{G}_i$ has G_i many slices. In practice, we suggest choosing $G_i \leq \lceil \log n \rceil$ so that there is a decent sample size within each slice for all slicing schemes. This is important because the fused Kolmogorov filter is a fully nonparametric method and sample size plays a central role in nonparametric statistics. Then the final fused Kolmogorov filter statistic is

$$\hat{K}_j = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{K}_j^{\mathbf{G}_i}. \tag{4}$$

and the fused Kolmogorov filter screening set is defined as

$$\hat{\mathbf{D}} = \{j : \hat{K}_j \text{ is among the } d_n\text{'th largest}\}. \tag{5}$$

3 Theory

In this section we establish the sure screening property of the fused Kolmogorov filter.

3.1 Main theorem

We first introduce an concept called the oracle fused Kolmogorov filter. If we knew the distribution of Y, then we could use an oracle uniform slicing such that the partition $\mathbf{G}_i$ contains the intervals bounded by the $\frac{l}{G_i}$th theoretical quantiles of Y for $l = 0, \ldots, G_i$. For this special slicing, write $K_j^{(o)}(G_i) = K_j^{\mathbf{G}_i}$ and $K_j^{(o)} = \sum_i K_j^{(o)}(G_i)$. Then we could obtain a screening set as $\hat{\mathbf{D}}(\text{oracle}) = \{j : \hat{K}_j^{(o)} \text{ is among the } d_n\text{'th largest}\}$, where d_n is a predefined positive integer. Throughout this section, C denotes a generic positive constant.

To show the sure screening property of the fused Kolmogorov filter, we consider the following two regularity conditions:

Regularity conditions:

(C1) There exists a set $\mathbf{S}$ such that $\mathbf{D} \subset \mathbf{S}$ and

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{S}} = \min_i (\min_{j \in \mathbf{S}} K_j^{(o)}(G_i) - \max_{j \notin \mathbf{S}} K_j^{(o)}(G_i)) > 0.$$

(C2) Let $G_{\min} = \min_i\{G_i\}$. Then for any b_1, b_2 such that $\Pr(Y \in [b_1, b_2)) \leq 2/G_{\min}$, we have

$$|F_j(x \mid y_1) - F_j(x \mid y_2)| \leq \frac{\Delta_{\mathbf{S}}}{8} \tag{6}$$

for all x, j and $y_1, y_2 \in [b_1, b_2)$.

Theorem 1. *Assume Conditions (C1) and (C2). Define*

$$\eta = CNp(\log^2 n) \exp(-C\frac{n\Delta_{\mathbf{S}}^2}{\log n}) + CN(\log^2 n) \exp(-C\frac{n}{\log^2 n}) \tag{7}$$

If $G_i\lceil \log n \rceil$ for all i and $d_n \geq |S|$, we have the following conclusions.

1. *For the oracle fused Kolmogorov filter, we have*

$$\Pr(\mathbf{D} \subset \hat{\mathbf{D}}(\text{oracle})) \geq 1 - \eta. \tag{8}$$

Therefore, the oracle fused Kolmogorov filter enjoys the sure screening property with an overwhelming probability if $\Delta_{\mathbf{S}} \gg \sqrt{\frac{\log n \cdot \log(pN \log n)}{n}}$.

2. *For the fused Kolmogorov filter defined in (4) and its screening set defined in (5), we have*

$$\Pr(\mathbf{D} \subset \hat{\mathbf{D}}) \geq 1 - \eta. \tag{9}$$

Therefore, the fused Kolmogorov filter enjoys the sure screening property with an overwhelming probability if $\Delta_{\mathbf{S}} \gg \sqrt{\frac{\log n \log(pN \log n)}{n}}$.

Remark 1. By comparing (8) and (9), we see that the fused Kolmogorov filter can handle the same order of dimensions as the oracle fused Kolmogorov filter. Therefore, slicing at the sample quantiles results in a method that is as powerful as one utilizing oracle information about the theoretical quantiles.

Remark 2. Theorem 1 shows that the fused Kolmogorov filter enjoys the sure screening property with overwhelming probability if we choose a reasonably large d_n. Clearly, the probabiluty of sure screening increases as d_n increases. In theory, if $|\mathbf{D}| = O(n^k)$ for some $0 < k < 1$, then we can use $d_n = a\lceil \frac{n}{\log n} \rceil$ where a is some constant. A more conservative choice could be $d_n = n$, which works as long as $|\mathbf{D}| < n$.

3.2 Comments on the regularity conditions

The conditions for Theorem 1 are very mild. First, note that, in contrast to DCS (Li, Zhong & Zhu 2012), we make no assumption on the distribution of $\mathbf{X}$. Therefore, the fused Kolmogorov filter is expected to be more powerful than DCS when the predictors are heavy-tailed. Moreover, we do not assume any form of the dependence of Y on $\mathbf{X}$. So the fused Kolmogorov filter will be more flexible than NIS and QA. The only two conditions we require are Conditions (C1) & (C2).

We first comment on Condition (C2). This condition is slightly stronger than requiring $F_j(x \mid y)$ to be continuous in y, as in Conclusion (c) of Lemma 1. Such a condition guarantees that the sample quantiles of Y are close enough to the population quantiles of Y. Obviously, this result is expected for many distributions of Y. A conseqence is that the actual slicing used in practice is very close (asymptotically) to the oracle slicing such that $\hat{K}_j$'s accurately approximate $\hat{K}_j^{(o)}$'s.

In order to establish the sure screening property, some nontrivial condition is needed. For example, the partial orthogonality condition, i.e., $\mathbf{X_D} \perp \mathbf{X_{D^c}}$ (Huang et al. 2008, Fan & Song 2010), has been considered in the literature. Clearly, the theory is more interesting when $\mathbf{X_D}$ and $\mathbf{X_{D^c}}$ are dependent. In our theory, Condition (C1) is the core condition which is used to guarantee that jointly important predictors should also be marginally important which is more or less assumed

in the theory for exisiting marginal screening methods in literature. In the context of binary classification, it has been shown that the sure screening property of Kolmogorov filter can be established even when $\mathbf{X_D}$ and $\mathbf{X_{D^c}}$ are strongly correlated (Mai & Zou 2013). This phenomenon can be generalized to the multiclass classification rather directly, whose derivation is omitted here for the sake of space. In what follows we focus on the case where Y is continuous and sondition (C1) can still be true even when $\mathbf{X_D}$ and $\mathbf{X_{D^c}}$ are strongly correlated and hence the sure screening property can hold with high probability. We highlight this interesting point by considering the following variable-transformation linear normal model:

$$T_y(Y) = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{X})^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon, \tag{10}$$

where $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \ldots, T_p)$ and $T_y, T_1, \ldots, T_p$ are strictly monotone univariate transformations. It is also assumed that $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{X}) \sim N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ with $\Sigma_{jj} = 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, p$ and $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ is independent of $\mathbf{X}$. Note that $(T_y, \mathbf{T})$ are unknown and we do not assume any parametric forms for them. Therefore, (10) is a very flexbile semiparametric regression model. The main idea in model (10) is that after whitening each variable in the dataset we could fit a linear regression model. This interesting model has close connections to many transformation models in the literature; for example, see Breiman & Friedman (1985), He & Shen (1997), Li, Peng, Zhang & Zhu (2012).

Lemma 3. *Consider the model in* (10)*. Without loss of generality, assume that* $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{D}}, 0)$*. Define* $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\beta}$*. Then for any set of* $\mathbf{G}_i, i = 1, \ldots, N$*, we have*

1. *Condition (C1) is true if and only if there exists* $\mathbf{S}$ *such that* $\min_{j\in\mathbf{S}} |\alpha_j| > \max_{j\notin\mathbf{S}} |\alpha_j|$.

2. *If* $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ *is blockwise independent, i.e.,* $\sigma_{ij} = 0$ *if* $i \in \mathbf{D}, j \notin \mathbf{D}$*, then* $\Delta_{\mathbf{D}} > 0$ *if and only if* $\min_{j\in\mathbf{D}} |\alpha_j| > 0$.

3. *Suppose* $\Sigma_{ij} = \rho^{|i-j|}$*. If* $\min_{j\in\mathbf{D}} |\alpha_j| > 0$ *and let*

$$\mathbf{S} = \{1, \ldots, d + \lceil \frac{\log\left(\min_{j\in\mathbf{D}} |\alpha_j|/|\alpha_d|\right)}{\log|\rho|} \rceil\},$$

   then $\Delta_{\mathbf{S}} > 0$.

4. *Suppose* $\Sigma_{ij} = \rho$ *and* $\Sigma_{jj} = 1$*. Define* $\mathbf{S} = \{j : \alpha_j \neq 0\}$*. Then* $\Delta_{\mathbf{S}} > 0$*. Moreover,* $\mathbf{D} \subset \mathbf{S}$ *if and only if* $1^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta} = 0$.

5. *Suppose* $\Sigma_{ij} = \rho$ *and* $\Sigma_{jj} = 1$. *Then* $\Delta_{\mathbf{D}} > 0$ *if* $\rho > 0$ *and* β_j *has the same sign for all* $j \in \mathbf{D}$.

In the following we discuss the implications of Lemma 3.

Remark 3. In part (3) where the covariance has an autoregressive structure, to ensure the sure screening property, we need $d_n \geq d + \lceil \frac{\log(\min_{j\in\mathbf{D}} |\alpha_j|/|\alpha_d|)}{\log|\rho|} \rceil$. It follows that

$$|\rho| \leq \exp(\frac{\log(\min_{j\in\mathbf{D}} |\alpha_j|/|\alpha_d|)}{d_n - d}). \tag{11}$$

With $d_n = \lceil \frac{n}{\log n} \rceil$, the upper bound of $|\rho|$ tends to 1. Therefore, there is little restriction on ρ. In part (4) and part (5) where $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ has the compound symmetry structure, ρ can be arbitrary as well.

Remark 4. A direct calculation shows that in the fused Kolmogorov filter K_j is monotone in α_j, while the joint importance X_j is measured by β_j. Part (2) of Lemma 3 corresponds to the partial orthogonality condition under which the important variables and noise variables are indendepent. So this is an expected result. Somewhat surprisingly, Parts (3)–(5) of Lemma 3 show that even when the predictors are highly correlated Condition (C1) still holds. Then by Theorem 1, the fused Kolmogorov filter will enjoy the sure screening property with high probability.

Remark 5. Let us consider the normal linear model where we further assume $T_y(Y) = Y$ and $T_j(X_j) = X_j$, i.e., $Y = \mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon$, where $\mathbf{X} \sim N(0, \mathbf{\Sigma})$. Lemma 3 can be applied to marginal correlation screening (SIS) and Distance dorrelation screening (DCS). However, the fused Kolmogorov filter is more flexible than SIS, DCS, and many other screening methods, because it is invariant under monotone transformations. Many existing screening methods except rank correlation screening (Li, Peng, Zhang & Zhu 2012) do not have this nice invariance property. As a result, when the true mode is a transformation normal linear model, SIS and DCS can perform poorly, while the fused Kolmogorov filter's performance remains the same regardless of the transformations. We will clearly demonstrate this point in the simulation study in Section 4.

4 Simulations

4.1 Simulation design

In this section, we compare the fused Kolmogorov filter with existing screening methods on simulated datasets. In all the models, we set $n = 500, p = 2000$. We consider the fused Kolmogorov filter based on $K_j(G_i)$ for $G_i = 3, \ldots, 7$, because $\lceil \log n \rceil = 7$. When the response is continuous, we slice Y at $\frac{l}{G_i}$'th sample quantiles for $l = 1, \ldots, G_i - 1$. We further include six other successful screening methods in literature for comparison, marginal correlation screening (SIS) (Fan & Lv 2008), nonparametric independence screening (NIS) (Fan et al. 2011), distance correlation screening (DCS) (Li, Zhong & Zhu 2012), rank correlation screening (RCS) (Li, Peng, Zhang & Zhu 2012), empirical likelihood screening (ELS) (Chang et al. 2013), and the quantile-adaptive screening (QA) (He et al. 2013). For the generalized linear model we also use SIS to denote the marginal maximum likelihood estimator (MMLE) (Fan & Song 2010) . For example, when Y is a multi-level categorical variable, SIS fits p multinomial models with the `R` package `nnet` and selects the predictors with the largest deviances. With a little abuse of notation, we refer to such methods as SIS when it is clear from the context.

Following He et al. (2013), we consider $\alpha = 0.5, 0.75$ for QA. We used the implementation of NIS and QA at

`http://users.stat.umn.edu/~wangx346/research/example1b.txt`.

The distance correlation was computed by the `R` package `energy`. For ELS, we used the implementation of ELS by the authors of Chang et al. (2013). As in Fan & Lv (2008), we report the minimum number of predictors needed to keep all the useful predictors. The results are based on 500 replicates. We considered the following six models in this simulation study.

Model 1: $T_y(Y) = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{X})^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon$, where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = 1.5 \times (1, -1, 0_{p-2})$, $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{X}) \sim N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathrm{CS}(0.75)$, $\epsilon \sim N(0, 1)$ is independent of $\mathbf{X}$. We consider three sets of $(T_y, \mathbf{T})$.

(a) $T_y(Y) = Y, T_j(X_j) = X_j$.

(b) $T_y(Y) = Y, T_j(X_j) = X_j^{1/9}$.

(c) $T_y(Y) = Y^{1/9}, T_j(X_j) = X_j$.

Models 1(a), 1(b), 1(c) are examples of Model (10) with an autoregressive correlation matrix and a strong autoregressive correlation coefficient 0.75.

Model 2: $Y = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{X})^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon$, where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = 0.8 \times (1_{10}, 0_{p-10})$. $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{X}) \sim N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathrm{AR}(0.75)$. Again, we consider three sets of $(T_y, \mathbf{T})$.

(a) $T_y(Y) = Y, T_j(X_j) = X_j$.

(b) $T_y(Y) = Y, T_j(X_j) = \frac{1}{2}\log X_j$.

(c) $T_y(Y) = \exp(Y), T_j(X_j) = X_j$.

Models 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) are examples of Model (10) with a compund symmetry correlation matrix and a strong correlation coefficient 0.75.

Model 3 (Single index regression model): $Y = (X_1 + X_2 + 1)^3 + \epsilon$, where X_j's follow Cauchy distributions independently and $\epsilon \sim N(0, 1)$ is independent of $\mathbf{X}$.

Model 4 (Additive model): $Y = 3X_1 + 4\tan(X_2) + 4X_3^2 + \epsilon$, where X_j's follow $\mathrm{Cauchy}(0, 1)$ independently and $\epsilon \sim \mathrm{Cauchy}(0, 1)$ is independent of $\mathbf{X}$.

Model 5 (Heteroskedastic regression model): $Y = 2(X_1 + 0.8X_2 + 0.6X_3 + 0.4X_4 + 0.2X_5) + \exp(X_{20} + X_{21} + X_{22})\epsilon$, where $\epsilon \sim N(0, 1)$, and $\mathbf{X} \sim N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathrm{AR}(0.8)$. This model is adapted from He et al. (2013). In He et al. (2013), they reported the minimum number of predictors to keep the first five predictors for QA with $\alpha = 0.5$, because QA with $\alpha = 0.5$ can only detect the predictors affecting the median. However, it is difficult to use such information for other methods. Therefore, we report the minimum number of predictors we need to keep all the eight important predictors for QA with $\alpha = 0.5$, too, so that it is fair to other methods.

Model 6 (Poisson regression model): $Y \sim \mathrm{Poisson}(\mu)$, where $\mu = \exp(\mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta})$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (0.2 \times 1_2, 0_{p-2})$, $X_j \sim t_2$ independently. The counterpart for SIS for this model is the marginal maximum likelihood estimator (MMLE) (Fan & Song 2010). Note that the predictors are heavy-tailed in this model and Y may consequently have extreme outliers. Therefore, to resolve computational issues, we delete an observation whenever $Y > 1000$ in MMLE. In addition, we consider the

Kolmogorov filter and DCS on this model, because all other methods are inapplicable to such datasets. Now, for the Kolmogorov filter, we set $H = Y$ if $Y < 2$; otherwise, $H = 3$.

Model 7 (Multiclass classification model): $Y = 1, \ldots, 5$. For each g, if $Y = g$, $X_{2(g-1)+1}$ and X_{2g} independently follow $0.5N(3, 1) + 0.5N(-3, 1)$, and $X_j \sim t_1$ independently for all other j. The counterpart for SIS for this model is to screen the predictors by marginally performing multinomial regression. Other than SIS, only the Kolmogorov filter and DCS are applicable to this model. Because Y is categorical, we directly take $H = Y$ for the Kolmogorov filter, and apply no further fusion. For DCS, we create a dummy variable $Y^{\mathrm{dm}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times 5}$ and compute the distance correlation between Y and X_j.

4.2 Simulation results and conclusions

The simulation results are reported in Table 1. There are two important conclusions.

- We see that the Kolmogorov filter using a single slicing works very well and its performance is rather insensitive to the choice of number of slices. Nevertheless, by combing different slicing schemes, the fused Kolmogorov filter has the best overall performance. The fused Kolmogorov filter is at least as good as the best $\hat{K}_j(G_i)$ in Models 1–3. In Models 4 & 5, where the fused Kolmogorov filter is slightly worse than the $\hat{K}_j(G_i)$ with the best G_i, the difference is very small.

- Compared with SIS, DCS, NIS, ELS and QA, the fused Kolmogorov filter is either the best or one of the best, and outperforms the rest by a large margin. This clearly shows that the fused Kolmogorov filter is a superior screening technique.

This simulation also reveals some major drawbacks of the exiting screening methods. Although SIS, DCS, NIS and ELS work well in Models 1(a) and 2(a), variable transformation as in Models 1(b)-1(c) and Models 2(b)-2(c) can easily destroy their performance. Models 3 & 4 are nonlinear with heavy-tailed covariates. Most screening methods other than the fused Kolmogorov filter have too many false discoveries, especially in Model 4. NIS, RCS and QA are not directly applicable when we have a Poisson regression model in Model 6. Model 5 has heteroscedasticity, which impairs SIS, NIS, RCS and ELS.

	Model 1			Model 2		
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(a)	(b)	(c)
	$d = 2$	$d = 2$	$d = 2$	$d = 10$	$d = 10$	$d = 10$
Kolmogorov						
$G = 3$	2(0.7)	2(0.7)	2(0.7)	10(0)	10(0)	10(0)
$G = 4$	3(3.9)	3(3.9)	3(3.9)	10(0)	10(0)	10(0)
$G = 5$	2(20.6)	2(20.6)	2(20.6)	10(0)	10(0)	10(0)
$G = 6$	9(40.8)	9(40.8)	9(40.8)	10(0)	10(0)	10(0)
$G = 7$	13(44.2)	13(44.2)	13(44.2)	10(0)	10(0)	10(0)
Fused	2(6.1)	2(6.1)	2(6.1)	10(0)	10(0)	10(0)
SIS	2(0)	802(376.6)	22.5(42.6)	10(0)	204(23.4)	166(10.0)
DCS	2(0)	297(24.0)	247.5(51.3)	10(0)	10(0)	32(4.2)
RCS	2(0)	2(0)	2(0)	10(0)	10(0)	10(0)
NIS	2(0)	2(0)	471(56.1)	10(0)	10(0)	290.5(16.7)
ELS	2(0)	1281(43.0)	905(47.8)	10(0)	10(0)	1254(71.3)
QA						
$\tau = 0.5$	2(0)	3(0.0)	2(0)	10(0)	10(0)	10(0)
$\tau = 0.75$	2(0.1)	10(1.5)	3(0.2)	10(0)	10(0)	10(0)
	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	
	$d = 2$	$d = 3$	$d = 8$	$d = 2$	$d = 10$	
Kolmogorov						
$G = 3$	2(0)	50.5(6.5)	12(0.2)	2(0)		
$G = 4$	2(0)	38(6.2)	10(0)			
$G = 5$	2(0)	51(6.6)	9(0.0)		10(0.4)	
$G = 6$	2(0)	74(5.9)	9(0)			
$G = 7$	2(0)	85(12.3)	8(0)			
Fused	2(0)	20(2.2)	9(0)			
SIS	111.5(13.1)	1272.5(36.4)	1678(26.0)	10(1.8)	1913.5(6.7)	
DCS	64(5.5)	1075(38.0)	11(0.5)	182.5(41.6)	653(87.7)	
RCS	2(0)	1351(45.7)	1087.5(39.7)			
NIS	129(26.7)	1369.5(26.5)	1720.5(17.5)			
ELS	1152(43.4)	1541(30.0)	1809.5(12.1)	1490.5(38.7)		
QA						
$\tau = 0.5$	10(0.5)	649.5(19.2)	324(65.4)			
$\tau = 0.75$	12(0.6)	970.5(51.5)	10(0.0)			

Table 1: Simulation results for Models 1–7. We report the minimum number of predictors needed to keep all the useful predictors. The numbers in the table are medians of 500 replicates. Standard errors are in parentheses. A cell is left empty if the corresponding method is not applied to the specific model.

5 A Real Data Example

In this section, we demonstrate the fused Kolmogorov filter on the Tecator dataset. The Tecator dataset is collected by Tecator Infratec Food and Feed Analyzer working in the wavelength range 850–1050 nm by the Near Infrared Transmission (NIT) principle. The predictors are 100 channel spectrum of absorbances. This dataset is available at `http://lib.stat.cmu.edu/datasets/tecator`. The provider of the dataset suggested using the first 215 samples to test the performance of a statistical method by treating 43 of them as the testing set. However, samples #103 and #105 appear to be outliers, so we deleted them and randomly chose 41 samples as our testing set in each replicate. Also, in addition to the 100 predictors in the original dataset, we added 900 independent noise variables following the Cauchy distribution.

We included the fused Kolmogorov filter, DCS, SIS, QA, NIS and ELS for comparison. First, we examine whether the screening methods can distinguish the useful predictors from the noise variables. In the fused Kolmogorov filter, we still consider the combination of $G_i = 3, \ldots, 7$, as in the simulation studies. For each screening method we kept the top 100 predictors,as the "truth" is there are 900 pure noise variables. We report the number of the original 100 predictors captuerd by screening in Table 2. It is easy to see that the fused Kolmogorov filter, DCS and NIS have much better performance in preserving the true predictors. In particular, the fused Kolmogorov filter has a nearly perfect screening result.

We examined how variable screening help predict the response variable. Again, we started with the augmented dataset with the additional 900 pure noise variables. For a nonparametric model-free method such as the fused Kolmogorov filter and DCS, the prediction is made by fitting a random forest after screening. Hence the resulting methods are called K-RF and DCS-RF, respectively. NIS is designed based on a generalized additive model. So when NIS is used for variable screening, the prediction is made by a sparse generalized additive model. We denote this method by NIS-GroupLasso. In K-RF, DCS-RF and NIS-GroupLasso, we let $d_n = 100$.

Moreover, we include an iterative procedure that performs NIS and group-lasso penalized regression repeatedly. After the initial screening, we keep the top 100 predictors, and then we follow Fan et al. (2011) to iteratively conduct the following two-step procedure: first, we add the predictor with the most predictive power that is not in the selected set of predictors; second, we delete some predictors in the selected set of predictors via group-lasso. In the deletion step, the tuning parameter is chosen to be the largest tuning parameter that produces an

	Kolmogorov	DCS	NIS	SIS	QA		ELS
					$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 0.75$	
True predictors	99.8	86.2	83.8	16.5	65.9	60.4	10.0
	(0.0)	(0.3)	(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.5)	(0.4)	(0.5)

Table 2: Comparison of the screening methods on the tecator dataset. We report the number of true predictors that are preserved after the screening step. The numbers are average over 100 replicates. Standard errors are in parentheses.

	K-RF	DCS-RF	NIS-GroupLasso	INIS-GroupLasso
Average mean squared error	0.140(0.019)	0.169(0.016)	3.85(0.016)	3.85(0.024)

Table 3: Comparison of the prediction performance on the tecator dataset. The numbers are average over 100 replicates. Standard errors are in parentheses.

error within one standard deviation of the minimum error. This resulting method is referred to as INIS-GroupLasso.

We used the `R` package `gglasso` (Yang & Zou 2014) to fit the group-lasso penalized additive model. The average mean squared errors on the testing sets are listed in Table 3. Both K-RF and DCS-RF perform better than NIS-GroupLasso and INIS-GroupLasso. Whereas the method K-RF gives the lowest mean squared error.

6 Discussion

In this paper we have proposed the fused Kolmogorov filter and demonstrated its superior performance over the exisiting screening methods. Before concluding this work, we would like to further comment on two main messages delieved in this paper. First, we have proposed the slicing and fusion idea to deal with general response variables such as continuous response variable and counts (e.g. Poisson) response variable. In this general approach one may use a different test statistic for testing the equivalence of two distrbutions to replace the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic and the resulting screening method would be different and likely effecetive as well. We prefer the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic because it is invariant under variable transformation and works naturally with many different types of covariates. Moreover, its sure screening property can be established without assuming any special distributional property of the covariates. Any future proposal for variable screening should possess all these nice properties of the fused Kolmogov filter and some nontrivial new property. The second message is on

nonparametric screening versus model-based screening. The vibrant research on variable screening started with a simple model-based method: marginal correlations screening. However, it is clear now that nonparametric model-free variable screening should be preferred in real data analysis, unless the user strongly believes that the data can be fit well by a parametric model. Otherwise, the nonparametric screening method is more robust, has wider applicablity and when combined with nonparametric learning techniques it can provide better prediction than a model-based method. On the other hand, an obvious advantage of model-based screening is that its performance can be boosted by an iterative screening and model-fitting procedure. It is unclear how to derive a similar iterative procedure for a nonparametric model-free screening method. It would be interesting and useful to do so such that we could have a more interative way to combine the fused Kolmogorov filter or other nonparametric screening method and nonparametric learning methods. This is an open question left for future study. We do not expect an easy solution. Note that even for the model-based iterative screening methods their theoretical properties still remain unknown.

Acknoledgements

We thank Professor Lan Wang for providing the implementation of QA and Professor Yichao Wu for providing the implementation of ELS.

Appendix: Technical Proofs

Proposition 1. *For an interval $[a, b)$ such that $f_y(y) > 0$ for $y \in [a, b)$, we have*

$$\min_{y\in[a,b)} F(x \mid Y = y) \le F(x \mid Y \in [a, b)) \le F(x \mid Y \in [a, b)) \le \max_{y\in[a,b)} F(x \mid Y = y)$$

for all x.

Proof of Proposition 1. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} F(x \mid Y \in [a, b)) &= \frac{\int_a^b \int_{-\infty}^x f(x, y)\,\mathrm{d}\,x\,\mathrm{d}\,y}{\int_a^b f_y(y)\,\mathrm{d}\,y} \\ &= \frac{\int_a^b \int_{-\infty}^x f(x \mid y) f_y(y)\,\mathrm{d}\,x\,\mathrm{d}\,y}{\int_a^b f_y(y)\,\mathrm{d}\,y}. \end{aligned}$$

Because

$$\min_{y\in[a,b)} F(x \mid Y=y) \le \int_{-\infty}^{x} f(x \mid y)\,\mathrm{d}\,x \le \max_{y\in[a,b)} F(x \mid Y=y),$$

we have the desired conclusion. □

Proof of Lemma 1. We start with the first conclusion. If X_j is independent of Y, then X_j will be independent for any H, which is a function of Y. Therefore, $K_j^{\mathbf{G}} = 0$ for all $\mathbf{G}$. Now suppose $K_j^{\mathbf{G}} = 0$ for all choices of $\mathbf{G}$. For any y, consider $H = 1$ if $Y \le y$ and $H = 2$ otherwise. Because $K_j^{\mathbf{G}} = 0$, X is independent of H. Consequently, $\Pr(Y \le y \mid X_j) = \Pr(Y \le y)$ for all y and Y is independent of X_j.

For the second conclusion, suppose $K_j^{\mathbf{G}} = 0$. Then $X_j \perp H$. Therefore, $\Pr(Y \le a_1 \mid X_j) = \Pr(H = 1 \mid X_j) = \Pr(H = 1)$ is a constant, which contradicts with our assumption. Therefore, we must have $K_j^{\mathbf{G}} \neq 0$.

Now we turn to the third conclusion. Define

$$K_j^* = \sup_{y_1,y_2} \sup_x |F_j(x \mid y_1) - F_j(x \mid y_2)|.$$

Because X_j is not independent of Y, $K_j^* > 0$. Hence, it suffices to show that $K^{\mathbf{G}} \to K_j^*$ as $G \to \infty$. This is indeed true. By the definition of K_j^*, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists (y_1^*, y_2^*, x^*) such that

$$|K_j - |F(x^* \mid y_1^*) - F(x^* \mid y_2^*)|| < \epsilon.$$

Because $F(x^* \mid y)$ is continuous in y, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $|F(x^* \mid y) - F(x^* \mid y_1^*)| < \epsilon$ for any $|y - y_1^*| < \delta$. Take $\phi = \Pr(|y - y_1^*| < \delta)$. Because $\max_{l=1,\ldots,G} \Pr(H = l) \to 0$, there exists G^* such that $\Pr(H = l) < \frac{\phi}{2}$ for $G > G^*$. In such cases, there exists $[a_{l_1}, b_{l_1}) \subset (y_1^* - \delta, y_1^* + \delta)$. By Proposition 1, we have

$$|F(x^* \mid H = l_1) - F(x^* \mid y_1^*)| < \epsilon.$$

Similarly, for sufficiently large G, there exists l_2 such that

$$|F(x^* \mid H = l_2) - F(x^* \mid y_2^*)| < \epsilon.$$

Now note that

$$|F(x^* \mid H = l_1) - F(x^* \mid H = l_2)| \le K_j^{\mathbf{G}} \le K_j.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & |K_j - K_j^{\mathbf{G}}| \\ \leq\ & |F(x^* \mid y_1^*) - F(x^* \mid y_2^*)| + \epsilon - |F(x^* \mid H = l_1) - F(x^* \mid H = l_2)| \\ \leq\ & \sum_{i=1,2} |F(x^* \mid y_i^*) - F(x^* \mid H = l_i)| + \epsilon \\ <\ & 3\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the conclusion follows. □

Proof of Lemma 2. For the first conclusion, note that if $\rho_j = 0$, then X_j is independent of Y and $K_j^* = 0$. On the other hand, of $\rho_j \neq 0$, $X_j \mid Y = y \sim N(\rho_j Y, (1-\rho_j^2))$. Therefore, $F_j(x \mid y) = \Phi(\frac{x - \rho_j y}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}})$. It follows that $K_j^* \geq \lim_{y \to -\infty} F_j(0 \mid y) - \lim_{y \to \infty} F_j(0 \mid y) = 1$. Meanwhile, by definition $K_j^* \leq 1$. Therefore, $K_j^* = 1$.

For the second conclusion, again by $X_j \mid Y \sim N(\rho_j Y, (1-\rho_j^2))$ and $F_j(x \mid y) = \Phi(\frac{x - \rho_j y}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_j(x \mid H = l) &= \frac{\Pr(X_j \leq x, H = l)}{\Pr(H = l)} \\ &= G \int_{a_{l-1}}^{a_l} \Phi(\frac{x - \rho_j y}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}) f(y)\, \mathrm{d}\, y \\ &\in [\Phi(\frac{x - \rho_j a_{l-1}}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}), \Phi(\frac{x - \rho_j a_l}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}})] \end{aligned}$$

Now, for $1 \leq l < m \leq G$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_x |F_j(x \mid H = l) - F_j(x \mid H = m)| \\ \leq\ & \sup_x (\Phi(\frac{x - \rho_j a_{l-1}}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}) - \Phi(\frac{x - \rho_j a_m}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}})) \\ =\ & 2\Phi(\frac{\rho(a_m - a_{l-1})}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}) - 1 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_x |F_j(x \mid H=1) - F_j(x \mid H=G)| \\
\geq & \sup_x (\Phi(\frac{x-\rho_j a_1}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}) - \Phi(\frac{x-\rho_j a_{G-1}}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}})) \\
= & 2\Phi(\frac{\rho_j(a_1 - a_{G-1})}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}) - 1 \geq 2\Phi(\frac{\rho_j(a_m - a_{l-1})}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}) - 1 \\
\geq & \sup_x |F_j(x \mid H=l) - F_j(x \mid H=m)|
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$K_j^{\mathbf{G}} = \sup_x |F_j(x \mid H=1) - F_j(x \mid H=G)|$$

Moreover, note that $a_1 = -a_{G-1}$. By checking the derivatives, we have

$$K_j^{\mathbf{G}} = |F_j(0 \mid H=1) - F_j(0 \mid H=G)|$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
K_j^{\mathbf{G}} &= G(\int_{-\infty}^{a_1} \Phi(\frac{-\rho_j y}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}) f(y)\,\mathrm{d}\,y - \int_{a_{G-1}}^{\infty} \Phi(\frac{-\rho_j y}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}) f(y)\,\mathrm{d}\,y) \\
&= G(\int_{-\infty}^{a_1} \Phi(\frac{-\rho_j y}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}) f(y)\,\mathrm{d}\,y - \int_{-\infty}^{a_1} (1 - \Phi(\frac{-\rho_j y}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}})) f(y)\,\mathrm{d}\,y) \\
&= G(\int_{-\infty}^{a_1} (2\Phi(\frac{-\rho_j y}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}}) - 1) f(y)\,\mathrm{d}\,y
\end{aligned}$$

Because $a_1 \leq 0$, $\Phi(\frac{-\rho_j y}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}})$ is strictly increasing in ρ_j for each $y \in (-\infty, a_1)$. Hence, $K_j^{\mathbf{G}}$ is strictly increasing in ρ_j. □

Now we prove Theorem 1. In order to prove this theorem, we need the following lemmas.

Lemma 4. *If $\hat{a}_l$ is the sample $\frac{l}{G}$th quantile for Y, then with a probability greater than $1 - C\exp(-C\frac{n}{G^2})$, we have*

$$\Pr(\hat{a}_l \leq Y < \hat{a}_{l+1}) < \frac{2}{G} \tag{12}$$

Lemma 5. *By the invariance under monotone transformation property, we only need to show the case when (X, Y) are bivariate normal. For conveninence, let $f(y)$ be the pdf of Y which is the standard normal pdf under the assumption. Under the conditions in Theorem 1, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have*

1.

$$\Pr(|\hat{K}_j^{(o)} - K_j^{(o)}| \geq N\epsilon) \leq CN(\log^2 n)\exp(-C\frac{n\epsilon^2}{\log n}) + CN(\log^2 n)\exp(-C\frac{n}{\log^2 n}) \tag{13}$$

2.

$$\Pr(|\hat{K}_j - K_j| \geq N\epsilon) \leq CN(\log^2 n)\exp(-C\frac{n\epsilon^2}{\log n}) \tag{14}$$

Lemma 6. *Under the conditions in Theorem 1, we have*

$$\Pr(|K_j - K_j^{(o)}| \geq N\Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4) \leq CN\exp(-C\frac{n}{\log^2 n})$$

With Lemmas 4–6, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. We first consider the first conclusion. Note that, if $|\hat{K}_j^{(o)} - K_j^{(o)}| < N\Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4$ for all j, we must have $\mathbf{D} \subset \hat{\mathbf{D}}$. This is indeed true, because, combining it with Condition (C1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{K}_j^{(o)} &> K_j^{(o)} - N\Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4 \geq \max_{j \notin \mathbf{S}} K_j^{(o)} + N\Delta/4 \text{ for } j \in \mathbf{S} \\
\hat{K}_j^{(o)} &< K_j^{(o)} + N\Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4 \leq \max_{j \notin \mathbf{S}} K_j^{(o)} + N\Delta/4 \text{ for } j \notin \mathbf{S}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathbf{S} \subset \hat{\mathbf{D}}$ and $\mathbf{D} \subset \hat{\mathbf{D}}$.

By (13), we have the desired conclusion.

For the second conclusion, we again have that, if $|\hat{K}_j - K_j^{(o)}| < N\Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4$ for all j, we must have $\mathbf{D} \subset \hat{\mathbf{D}}$.

Combining (14) and Lemma 6, we have

$$\Pr(|\hat{K}_j - K_j^{(o)}| > N\Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4) \leq CN\exp(-C\frac{n}{\log^2 n}) + CN(\log^2 n)\exp(-C\frac{n\Delta_{\mathbf{S}}^2}{\log n}).$$

Then we have the desired conclusion.

□

Proof of Lemma 4. First, we show that, under the event $A = \sup_y |\hat{F}_y(y) - F_y(y)| \leq \frac{1}{8G}$, we must have (12). Indeed, under event A

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(\hat{a}_l \leq Y < \hat{a}_{l+1}) = \Pr(\frac{l}{G} \leq \hat{F}_y(Y) < \frac{l+1}{G}) \\ \leq \; & \Pr(\frac{l}{G} - \frac{1}{8G} \leq F_y(Y) < \frac{l+1}{G} + \frac{1}{8G}) = \frac{5}{4G} < \frac{2}{G} \end{aligned}$$

Then note $\Pr(A) \geq 1 - C\exp(-C\frac{n}{G^2})$ by the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz inequality, and the conclusion follows. □

Proof of Lemma 5. We first show (13). Consider a single partition $\mathbf{G}_i$ with G_i intervals bounded by the theoretical quantiles. Then $H_i^{(o)} = g$ if and only if Y is between its $\frac{g}{G_i}$th and $\frac{g+1}{G_i}$th quantile. Set $K^{(o)}(G_i; g, g') = \sup_x |F_j(x \mid H_i^{(o)} = g) - F_j(x \mid H_i^{(o)} = g')|$. Then $\Pr(H_i^{(o)} = g) = \Pr(H_i^{(o)} = g') = \frac{1}{G_i}$. By Lemma A1 in Mai & Zou (2013), we have

$$\Pr(|\hat{K}_j^{(o)}(G_i; g, g') - K_j^{(o)}(G_i; g, g')| \geq \epsilon) \leq C\exp(-Cn\frac{\epsilon^2}{G_i}) + C\exp(-C\frac{n}{G_i^2}).$$

Then, if $|\hat{K}_j^{(o)}(G_i; g, g') - K_j^{(o)}(G_i; g, g')| \geq \epsilon$ for all g, g', we must have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{K}_j^{(o)} - K_j^{(o)}| \; &= \; |\max_{g,g'} \hat{K}_j^{(o)}(G_i; g, g') - \max_{g,g'} K_j^{(o)}(G_i; g, g')| \\ &\leq \; \max_{g,g'} |\hat{K}_j^{(o)}(G_i; g, g') - K_j^{(o)}(G_i; g, g')| \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(|\hat{K}_j^{(o)}(G_i) - K_j^{(o)}(G_i)| > \epsilon) \\ \leq \; & CG_i^2\exp(-Cn\frac{\epsilon^2}{G_i}) + CG_i^2\exp(-C\frac{n}{G_i^2}) \\ \leq \; & C(\log^2 n)\exp(-Cn\frac{\epsilon^2}{\log n}) + C(\log^2 n)\exp(-C\frac{n}{\log^2 n}) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that

$$\Pr(|\hat{K}_j^{(o)}(G_i) - K_j^{(o)}(G_i)| > N\epsilon) \leq \sum_i \Pr(|\hat{K}_j^{(o)}(G_i) - K_j^{(o)}(G_i)| > \epsilon)$$

and the conclusion follows. For (14), redefine $H_i = l$ if Y is with in the $\frac{l}{G_i}$th and $\frac{l+1}{G_i}$th sample quantiles. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(|\hat{K}_j(G_i; g, g') - \hat{K}_j(G_i; g, g')| \geq \epsilon) \\ \leq & \sum_{l=g,g'} \Pr(\sup_x |\hat{F}_j(x \mid H_i = l) - F_j(x \mid H_i = l)| \geq \epsilon/2) \\ \leq & C \exp(-Cn\frac{\epsilon^2}{G_i}) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz inequality and the fact that there are $\frac{n}{G_i}$ observations in the gth and g'th slice, respectively. Then because $G_i \leq \lceil \log n \rceil$, we have the desired conclusion. Finally, (14) can be proven in a similar way to (13). □

Proof of Lemma 6. First, note that

$$\Pr(|K_j - K_j^{(o)}| \geq N\Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4) \leq \sum_i \Pr(|K_j(G_i) - K_j^{(o)}(G_i)| \geq \Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4) \qquad (15)$$

Therefore, we establish a bound for $\Pr(|K_j(G_i) - K_j^{(o)}(G_i)| \geq \Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4)$.

Define

$$K_{0j} = \sup_x(\sup_y F(x \mid y) - \inf_y F(x \mid y))$$

For any x and l, we have

$$\inf_y F_j(x \mid y) \leq F_j(x \mid H = l) \leq \sup_y F_j(x \mid y).$$

It follows that $K_j(G_i) \leq K_{0j}$ and $K_j^{(o)}(G_i) \leq K_{0j}$. Moreover, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists (x^*, y_1^*, y_2^*) such that

$$K_{0j} \leq F_j(x^* \mid y_1^*) - F_j(x^* \mid y_2^*) + \epsilon.$$

Then there exists $[a_{l_i}, a_{l_i+1}) \in \mathbf{G}$ such that $y_i^* \in [a_{l_i}, a_{l_i+1})$. Hence,

$$K_{0j} - K_j^{(o)}(G_i) \leq \epsilon + \sum_{i=1,2} |F_j(x^* \mid y_1^*) - F_j(x^* \mid H = l_i)| \leq \epsilon + \Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/8$$

where the last inequality follows from Condition (C2) and Proposition 1. Because ϵ is arbitrary, we have $K_{0j} - K_j^{(o)}(G_i) \leq \Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/8$ and hence $K_j \leq K_j^{(o)}(G_i) + \Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/8$. On the other hand, suppose

$$K_j^{(o)}(G_i) = F_j(x_0 \mid H_i^{(o)} = l_1) - F_j(x_0 \mid H_i^{(o)} = l_2).$$

Set y_1^* such that $y_1^* \in \{y : H_i^{(o)} = l_1\}$ and $\inf_{y:H_i^{(o)}=l_1} F_j(x \mid y) = F_j(x \mid y_1^*)$. Note that y_1^* can take infinite values. Then there exists l_1' such that $y_1^* \in \{H_i^{(o)} = l_1\} \cap \{H_i = l_1'\}$. Also define y_2^* as the number that $y_2^* \in \{y : H_i^{(o)} = l_2\}$ and $\sup_{y:H_i^{(o)}=l_1} F_j(x \mid y) = F_j(x \mid y_2^*)$. Note that y_2^* can take infinite values as well. Then there exists l_2' such that $y_2^* \in \{H_i^{(o)} = l_2\} \cap \{H_i = l_2'\}$.

Claim that, if $\Pr(H_i = l_k') \leq 2/G$, we must have $K_j(G_i) \leq K_j^{(o)}(G_i) - \Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4$. Indeed, by Proposition 1,

$$K_j \geq \inf_{y:H_i=l_1'} F_j(x_0 \mid y) - \sup_{y:H_i=l_2'} F_j(x_0 \mid y)|$$

Then by Condition (C2), if $\Pr(H_i = l_k') \leq 2/G$, we must have

$$\begin{aligned} K_j &\geq \inf_{y:H_i=l_1'} F_j(x_0 \mid y) - \sup_{y:H_i=l_2'} F_j(x_0 \mid y)| \\ &\geq F_j(x_0 \mid y_1^*) - F_j(x_0 \mid y_2^*)| \\ &\geq \inf_{y:H_i^{(o)}=l_1} F_j(x^* \mid y) - \Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/8 - \sup_{y:H_i^{(o)}=l_2} F_j(x^* \mid y)| - \Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/8 \\ &\geq K_j^{(o)} - \Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality again follows from Condition (C2) and Proposition 1.

By Lemma 4, we have

$$\Pr(\Pr(H_i = l_k') > 2/G) \leq C \exp(-C \frac{n}{G_i^2})$$

Therefore,

$$\Pr(|K_j(G_i) - K_j^{(o)}(G_i)| \geq \Delta_{\mathbf{S}}/4) \leq C \exp(-C \frac{n}{G_i^2}) \leq C \exp(-C \frac{n}{\log^2 n}) \quad (16)$$

Combining (15) and (16) we have the desired conclusion. □

Proof of Lemma 3. For the first conclusion, note that

$$\begin{pmatrix} T_y(Y) \\ \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{X}) \end{pmatrix} \sim N\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \sigma^2 & \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\beta} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Straightforward calculation shows that

$$|\operatorname{cor}(T_y(Y), T_j(X_j))| = \frac{|\alpha_j|}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \sigma^2}}$$

is monotone in $|\alpha_j|$. Now that, for any G_i, $K_j^o(G_i)$ is invariant under strictly monotone transformations. Therefore, by the second conclusion in Lemma 2, $K_j^o(G_i)$ is strictly increasing in $|\alpha_j|$. And the conclusion follows.

For the second conclusion, note that when $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is blockwise independent, we must have $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{D}^C} = 0$.

For the third conclusion, note that for $j > d$, we have $\alpha_j = \rho^{j-d}\alpha_d$. When $j > d + \dfrac{\log \min_{j\in\mathbf{D}} |\alpha_j|/|\alpha_d|}{\log |\rho|}$, we must have $|\alpha_j| < \min_{j\in\mathbf{D}} |\alpha_j$, and the conclusion follows.

For the third conclusion, write $\mathbf{\Sigma} = (1-\rho)\mathbf{I} + \rho\mathbf{J}$, where $\mathbf{J}$ is a $p \times p$ matrix of 1. Then $\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} = (1-\rho)^{-1}I - \rho[\{1+(p-1)\rho\}(1-\rho)]^{-1}\mathbf{J}$. Write $c = 1^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta} = \sum_{j\in\mathbf{S}} \beta_j$. For any $j \in \mathbf{S}$, we have $\beta_j = -\rho[\{1+(p-1)\rho\}(1-\rho)]^{-1}c$. Thus, $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{S} \Leftrightarrow 1^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta} = 0$.

For the fourth conclusion, note that for any $j \in \mathbf{D}$, we have $\alpha_j = (1-\rho)\beta_j + \rho 1^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta}$, while for $j \notin \mathbf{D}$, we have $\alpha_j = \rho 1^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Hence, when $\rho > 0$ and β_j has the same sign for all $j \in \mathbf{D}$, we have $\Delta_{\mathbf{D}} > 0$. □

References

Breiman, L. & Friedman, J. H. (1985), 'Estimating optimal transformations for multiple regression and correlation', *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **80**, 580–598.

Chang, J., Tang, C. Y. & Wu, Y. (2013), 'Marginal empirical likelihood and sure independence feature screening', *Ann. Statist.* **41**, 2123–2148.

Cook, R. D. & Weisberg, S. (1991), 'Comment on "sliced inverse regression for dimension reduction"', *Journal of American Statistical Association* **86**, 328–332.

Cook, R. D. & Zhang, X. (2013), 'Fused estimators of the central subspace in sufficient dimension reduction', *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **In press**.

Fan, J. & Fan, Y. (2008), 'High dimensional classification using features annealed independence rules', *Ann. Statist.* **36**, 2605–2637.

Fan, J., Feng, Y. & Song, R. (2011), 'Nonparametric independence screening in sparse ultra-high-dimensional additive models', *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **106**, 544–557.

Fan, J. & Li, R. (2001), 'Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties', *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.* **96**, 1348–1360.

Fan, J. & Lv, J. (2008), 'Sure independence screening for ultra-high dimensional feature space.', *J. R. Statist. Soc. B* **20**, 101–148.

Fan, J., Samworth, R. & Wu, Y. (2009), 'Ultra-dimensional variable selection via independenct learning: Beyond the linear model.', *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **10**, 1829–1853.

Fan, J. & Song, R. (2010), 'Sure independence screening in generalized linear models with NP-dimensionality.', *Ann. Statist.* **38**(6), 3567–3604.

Hastie, T. J., Tibshirani, R. J. & Friedman, J. H. (2009), *Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*, second edn, Springer Verlag.

Hastie, T. & Tibshirani, R. (2003), 'Classification by pairwise coupling', *Annals of Statistics* **26**(2), 451–800.

He, X. & Shen, L. (1997), 'Linear regression after spline transformation', *Biometrika* **84**, 474–481.

He, X., Wang, L. & Hong, H. G. (2013), 'Quantile-adaptive model-free variable screening for high-dimensional heterogeneous data', *The Ann. Statist* **41**, 342–369.

Hsing, T. & Carroll, R. (1992), 'An asymptotic theory for sliced inverse regression', *The Ann. Statist* **20**, 1040–1061.

Huang, J., Horowitz, J. & Ma, S. (2008), 'Asymptotic properties of bridge estimators in proportional harzards frailty regression models.', *Ann. Statist.* **36**, 587–613.

Li, G., Peng, H., Zhang, J. & Zhu, L.-X. (2012), 'Robust rank correlation based screening', *Ann. Statist.* **40**, 1846–1877.

Li, K.-C. (1991), 'Sliced inverse regression for dimension reduction', *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **86**, 316–327.

Li, R., Zhong, W. & Zhu, L.-P. (2012), 'Feature screening via distance correlation learning', *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.* **107**, 1129–1139.

Lv, J. & Fan, J. (2009), 'A unified approach to model selection and sparse recovery using regularized least squares.', *Annals of Statistics* **37**, 3498–3528.

Mai, Q. & Zou, H. (2013), 'The kolmogorov filter for variable screening in high-dimensional binary classification', *Biometrika* **100**, 229–234.

Székely, G. J., Rizzo, M. L. & Bakirov, N. K. (2007), 'Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances', *Annals of Statistics* **35**, 2769–2794.

Tibshirani, R. (1996), 'Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso', *J. R. Statist. Soc. B* **58**, 267–288.

Yang, Y. & Zou, H. (2014), A fast unified algorithm for solving group-lasso penalized learning problems.

Zhang, C. (2010), 'Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty', *The Ann. Statist* **38**, 894–942.

Zhu, L. & Ng, K. W. (1995), 'Asymptotics of sliced inverse regression', *Statist. Sinica* **5**, 727–736.

Zhu, L.-P., Li, L., Li, R. & Zhu, L.-X. (2011), 'Model-free feature screening for ultrahigh dimensional data', *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.* **106**, 1464–1475.